

### REMARKS

The Official Action of September 30, 2004 has been carefully considered and reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 has been amended to depend from claim 8 (rather than from canceled claim 21) whereby to remove the basis for the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph appearing at paragraph 3 of the Official Action. Claim 8 has also been amended to limit the solid wetting agent to a subset of the wetting agents described in the Markush group formerly recited in claim 24 (now canceled). Claims 23, 24 and 35 have been canceled in view of the amendment to claim 8.

The claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over a combination including (a) Freeman et al in view of Ohta et al or (b) Ganapathiappan et al in view of Ohta et al or (c) one of these combinations further in view of the reference(s) cited in paragraphs 6, 7, 9, 10 or 11 of the Official Action. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.


In Applicants' Amendment filed July 19, 2004, Applicants argued that the evidence of record supports a finding that the claimed invention would not have been obvious by pointing to the evidence of record which shows that the claimed ink composition comprising a solid wetting agent provides unexpectedly advantageous results in the anti-clogging and storage stability evaluations as compared with ink compositions lacking the solid wetting agent. The Examiner contends that this evidence is not unexpected in view of Ohta et al which allegedly recognizes the

criticality of using a solid wetting agent such as saccharides.

Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of the Ohta et al reference to which the Examiner refers show the criticality, if any, of saccharides/sugar alcohols only; the referenced portions of Ohta et al do not show or suggest the use of any of the solid wetting agents now claimed. Moreover, assuming for the sake of argument that Ohta et al were considered to teach **the criticality** of including a saccharide/sugar alcohol in an ink composition as the solid wetting agent, in that event it would teach away from substituting another solid wetting agent, such as the solid wetting agents recited in all claims as amended. This being the case, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art does not set forth even a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the invention as now claimed.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all rejections and objections of record have been overcome and that the application is now in allowable form. An early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited and is believed to be fully warranted.

Respectfully submitted,



CLIFFORD J. MASS  
LADAS & PARRY  
26 WEST 61ST STREET  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023  
REG. NO.30,086(212)708-1890